



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/823,070	03/30/2001	Priya Rajagopal	042390.P10458	8238	
7590	08/13/2004	EXAMINER			
Gordon R. Lindeen III	NGUYEN, DUSTIN				
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP Seventh Floor 12400 Wilshire Boulevard Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	2154	DATE MAILED: 08/13/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/823,070	RAJAGOPAL ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Dustin Nguyen	2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 June 2001.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1 – 20 are presented for examination.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 4 and 17 are objected to because of the following informalities: no period at the end of the claims. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 10-13, and 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

- A. The following terms lack antecedent basis:

I.	the medium	-	claims 10-13, lines 1
II.	the computer	-	claims 15-20, line 1

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

6. Claims 1-7, 9-12, 14-17, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Voth [US Patent No 6,199,169].

7. As per claim 1, Voth discloses the invention substantially as claimed including a method comprising:

obtaining a processor tick counter value from a first processing engine [604-608, Figure 6; col 6, lines 31-37; and col 8, lines 57-67];

comparing the obtained processor tick counter value to a processor tick counter value from a second processing engine [col 6, lines 38-53];

and determining a timing offset for synchronizing the first processing engine and the second processing engine using the comparison [col 6, lines 54-col 7, lines 18].

8. As per claim 2, Voth discloses wherein obtaining a processor tick counter value comprises sending a request message from the second processing engine to the first processing engine, and receiving a reply from the first processing engine at the second processing engine [Figure 6; and col 2, lines 57-63].

9. As per claim 3, Voth discloses wherein the processor tick counter value at the second processing engine is determined by recording the time at which the request message is sent [Figure 4; and col 5, lines 26-32].

10. As per claim 4, Voth discloses wherein the processor tick counter value at the second processing engine is determined by recording the time at which the reply is received [i.e. add] [col 2, lines 61-63].

11. As per claim 5, Voth discloses repeating sending a request message, recording the time, receiving a reply, recording the time and determining a timing offset until the determined timing offsets are within a predetermined variability range [i.e. repeat update] [col 3, lines 10-19].

12. As per claim 6, Voth discloses applying a time stamp to a message sent from the second processor [Abstract], the time stamp being determined by applying the determined timing offset [628, Figure 6; and col 16, lines 53-54].

13. As per claim 7, Voth discloses receiving an instruction having an execution time and interpreting the execution time by applying the determined timing offset [626, 628, Figure 6; and col 3, lines 3-7].

14. As per claim 9, it is program product claimed of claim 1, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 1.

15. As per claims 10-12, they are program product claimed of claims 2-4, they are rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 2-4.

16. As per claim 14, it is apparatus claimed of claim 1, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 1.

17. As per claims 15-17, they are apparatus claimed of claims 2-4, they are rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 2-4.

18. As per claims 19 and 20, they are apparatus claimed of claims 6 and 7, they are rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 6 and 7.

19. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

20. Claims 8, 13 and 18, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Voth [US Patent No 6,199,169], in view of Ozcetin et al. [US Patent No 6,611,922].

21. As per claim 8, Voth does not specifically disclose obtaining a processor frequency from the first processing engine; obtaining a processor frequency from the second processing engine; and correcting the timing offset for any difference between the first processing engine frequency and the second processing engine frequency. Ozcetin discloses obtaining a processor frequency from the first processing engine; obtaining a processor frequency from the second processing engine; and correcting the timing offset for any difference between the first processing engine frequency and the second processing engine frequency [col 3, lines 41-55; and col 9, lines 61-col 10, lines 9]. It would have been obvious to a person skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Voth and Ozcetin because Ozcetin's teaching would allow to synchronize internal clock times of monitors to a universal time or line frequency and synchronizing internal clock times without causing discontinuities and drift [Ozcetin, col 3, lines 24-28].

22. As per claim 13, it is program product claimed of claim 8, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 8.

23. As per claim 18, it is apparatus claimed of claim 8, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 8.

24. A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire **3 (three) months and 0 (zero) days** from the mail date of this letter. Failure to respond within the period for response will result in **ABANDONMENT** of the application (see 35 U.S.C 133, M.P.E.P 710.02, 710.02(b)).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dustin Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 305-5321. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday – Friday (8:00 – 5:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (703) 305-8498.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Dustin Nguyen



JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
~ TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100